Service Pathway Emotional Safety Audit

Evaluate your clinical environment through a neurodivergent (ND) lens.

By Neal Glendenning

Contact: info@theneuroinclusionproject.co.uk

Important note

This resource is intended to support understanding and good practice in neuro-inclusive workplace design. It provides general guidance and does not constitute legal, medical, or clinical advice. Organisations should apply the principles in line with their own policies, regulatory obligations, and professional judgement.

A clear orientation (for services and systems)

This is not a clinical outcomes audit.
It is not a staff performance review.
It is not a patient satisfaction survey.

This audit exists because **emotional safety across a service pathway…** from referral to discharge… is one of the strongest predictors of:

- engagement
- accuracy of assessment
- escalation risk
- drop-out
- long-term trust

For many neurodivergent (ND) patients, harm does not come from one interaction. It comes from **cumulative threat** across the pathway.

This audit helps services:

- identify where threat is unintentionally introduced
- understand how power, pacing, and ambiguity affect ND nervous systems
- reduce escalation and re-presentation
- redesign pathways for safety, not just efficiency

This audit should be used to **change conditions**, not to judge staff or patients.

---

1. Core reframe: emotional safety is a pathway property

Emotional safety is often framed as:

- bedside manner
- individual clinician skill
- rapport

For ND patients, emotional safety is **systemic**.

It is shaped by:

- predictability
- clarity
- sensory load
- communication style
- power dynamics
- continuity

A patient may feel safe with one clinician and unsafe with the pathway overall.

If distress repeatedly appears at the same points, the issue is structural.

---

2. How to use this audit safely

Who should use it

- Clinical leads
- Service managers
- Quality & safety teams
- Pathway redesign groups

How to use it

- Walk the pathway step-by-step (referral → discharge)
- Involve multiple perspectives (clinical, admin, lived experience)
- Look for *patterns*, not isolated failures
- Prioritise areas of cumulative load

What not to do

- Do not attach this to performance management
- Do not require patient disclosure to act
- Do not treat findings as “complaints”

This is a **design audit**, not a blame exercise.

---

3. Understanding cumulative emotional load

Emotional safety is eroded by:

- repeated uncertainty
- repeated self-advocacy
- repeated exposure to power imbalance
- repeated sensory overload
- repeated invalidation or minimisation

Each individual interaction may seem minor.

Together, they create:

- hypervigilance
- shutdown
- avoidance

- crisis escalation

This audit examines **how strain accumulates across time**.

---

4. Audit domain 1… Entry & referral

First contact sets the nervous system tone.

Consider:

- Are referral criteria clearly explained in plain language?
- Do patients know what will happen *after* referral?
- Is confirmation of receipt timely and explicit?
- Is uncertainty named honestly, not glossed over?
- Is there one clear contact route for questions?

Risk indicators:

- silence after referral
- vague timelines
- multiple redirections
- “wait and see” language

Early ambiguity often produces downstream escalation.

---

5. Audit domain 2… Waiting periods

Waiting is an active safety period, not neutral time.

Consider:

- Are patients told they are on the waiting list — clearly and explicitly?
- Are updates sent predictably, even when nothing has changed?
- Are timeframes realistic and uncertainty acknowledged?
- Is support available without requiring diagnosis or disclosure?
- Is escalation guidance clear and non-punitive?

Risk indicators:

- long silences
- reassurance without structure
- patients re-contacting repeatedly for clarity
- crisis presentations during waits

Silence increases threat more than delay itself.

6. Audit domain 3… First appointments & triage

Accuracy depends on safety.

Consider:

- Is the purpose of the appointment explained upfront?
- Is the structure of the interaction made explicit?
- Are questions paced and concrete?
- Is processing time allowed?
- Are sensory factors (noise, lighting, crowding) considered?

Risk indicators:

- rapid questioning
- visible rushing
- abstract or evaluative questions
- emotional escalation or shutdown during assessment

If patients cannot regulate, information quality drops.

7. Audit domain 4… Communication style across the pathway

Communication is a regulation tool.

Consider:

- Are expectations stated explicitly, or implied?
- Are changes clearly named (what changed / what didn't)?
- Are written summaries provided after key interactions?
- Is tone neutral and non-evaluative?
- Are patients expected to infer urgency or meaning?

Risk indicators:

- "you should know" language
- mixed messages
- frequent clarification requests
- distress following feedback

Ambiguity is not neutral for ND nervous systems.

8. Audit domain 5… Sensory environment

Sensory load directly affects emotional regulation.

Consider across the pathway:

- waiting areas
- reception desks
- assessment rooms
- corridors and transitions

Ask:

- Is noise predictable or chaotic?
- Is lighting harsh or flickering?
- Are spaces crowded or visually overwhelming?
- Is there privacy for sensitive conversations?

Risk indicators:

- agitation before appointments
- shutdown in waiting areas
- patients arriving already dysregulated

Sensory strain before interaction reduces capacity during it.

---

9. Audit domain 6… Power, consent & choice

Power imbalance amplifies threat.

Consider:

- Are patients told what is optional vs required?
- Is consent explicit, not assumed?
- Can patients pause, slow down, or ask for clarification safely?
- Is disclosure ever implicitly required for access?

Risk indicators:

- compliance without understanding
- over-explaining
- avoidance of questions
- reluctance to re-engage

Choice… even small… restores agency.

---

10. Audit domain 7… Transitions & handovers

Transitions are high-risk moments.

Consider:

- Are handovers explained to patients?
- Do patients know who is responsible at each stage?
- Is information carried forward, or repeatedly re-asked?
- Are changes in clinician or service named clearly?

Risk indicators:

- repeated retelling
- confusion about next steps
- drop-out at transition points

Continuity is emotional safety.

---

11. Audit domain 8… Feedback, decisions & outcomes

How decisions are communicated matters as much as the decision.

Consider:

- Are decisions explained in plain language?
- Is rationale shared without defensiveness?
- Are next steps explicit and written?
- Is emotional response anticipated and allowed?

Risk indicators:

- patients feeling dismissed
- distress after outcome letters
- complaints driven by confusion, not disagreement

Clarity reduces threat even when outcomes are difficult.

---

12. Audit domain 9… Escalation & distress response

Distress is often a system signal.

Consider:

- Are early signs of distress recognised?
- Is escalation met with curiosity or correction?
- Are staff trained to reduce demand before seeking explanation?
- Is safeguarding handled without alarmist tone?

Risk indicators:

- distress treated as behaviour
- pressure to “calm down”
- punitive framing of escalation

Stabilisation must come before problem-solving.

---

13. Audit domain 10… Discharge & endings

Endings shape memory and future trust.

Consider:

- Is discharge explained clearly and respectfully?
- Are patients told what support remains available?
- Are re-entry routes explicit?
- Is written closure provided?

Risk indicators:

- abrupt endings
- unclear follow-up
- patients re-presenting through crisis routes

Unclear endings feel like abandonment.

---

14. Interpreting audit findings

When reviewing findings:

- look for **repeated strain points**
- prioritise areas where threat accumulates
- start with low-cost clarity and predictability fixes
- test changes iteratively

Avoid:

- trying to fix everything at once
- framing safety improvements as “extras”

Small changes at key points often have outsized impact.

---

15. A simple pathway safety snapshot (copy–adapt–use)

Highest emotional threat points:

Most common patient distress signals:

Where ambiguity is highest:

Quick changes we can make now:

Structural redesigns to explore:

This keeps focus on **action**, not analysis paralysis.

---

16. Organisational guardrails (non-negotiable)

This audit must not be used to:

- justify delays or capacity limits
- assess patient “coping”
- score staff empathy
- require ND disclosure
- shift responsibility onto patients

If safety depends on patients self-regulating, the pathway is unsafe.

A closing note for services

ND patients are not “hard to support.”

They are navigating systems that:

- move quickly
- explain little
- demand regulation under pressure

When services evaluate pathways through an ND lens, they often discover that:

- distress reduces
- accuracy improves
- escalation drops
- trust rebuilds

Not because patients change…
but because **the system stops adding unnecessary threat**.

Emotional safety is not an add-on.

It is the infrastructure that allows care to work at all.